

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 16 are independent claims. No claims have been canceled or amended.

Claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,199,082 (“Ferrel”). In particular, the office action suggests that Ferrel’s “style sheet editor that is used to create and edit style sheets” teaches “an editing process” that receives “a selection of a content-control statement corresponding to each selected piece of content, each content-control statement specifying for each of at least some items of the corresponding piece of content a control from the edit form to be employed to display the item in the page and thereby binding the corresponding piece of content to the edit form,” as recited by independent claims 1 and 16. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

To anticipate, Ferrel must disclose every element in every rejected claim in the above-identified patent application and such a disclosure must be as complete in detail as the claims in the above-identified patent application. MPEP § 2131.

“Ferrel discloses a style sheet editor that is used to create and edit style sheets” that describe “font usage and text layout” for content published by a multimedia publishing system. (See Office Action ¶ 5, Ferrel – col. 16, ll. 65 – col. 17, ll. 5). The style sheet editor and style sheets “provide a way for the designer to set text formatting property on a per control basis by creating a different style sheet for each control or set of controls.” (See Ferrel – col. 35, ll. 22-25). The control, which “contain instructions for gathering, formatting and displaying the linked content onto the page,” can format the content displayed on the page by comparing the current style of the content with the style sheet. (See Ferrel – col. 8, ll. 43-45; ll. 52-55). For example, “in one control, the title might be displayed using a 14 point font and bold emphasis, whereas the same piece of content in a different control on the page can be displayed in a 12 point font and italic emphasis.” (See Ferrel – col. 8, ll. 58-64).

However, there is no discussion in Ferrell regarding “an editing process” that receives “a selection of a content-control statement corresponding to each selected piece of content, each content-control statement specifying for each of at least some items of the corresponding piece of content a control from the edit form to be employed to display the

item in the page and thereby binding the corresponding piece of content to the edit form,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 16.

Providing a style sheet to format font and text does not disclose an editing process that uses a “content-control statement” that specifies a control for an item of a piece of content to bind an edit form with the piece of content. In Ferrel, the style sheet provides text formatting on a per control basis, but Ferrel does not disclose that the style sheet is used in an editing process to bind an edit form or a control from the edit form to a piece of content or an item of the piece of content. Therefore, the style sheet, as described in Ferrel, is not a “content-control statement,” as recited in the claimed embodiments. Additionally, the Examiner has acknowledged that the “style sheets,” described in Ferrel, do not disclose a “content-control statement” by asserting, in the rejection of independent claims 1 and 16, that “[i]t has been established and is known in the art that *style sheets typically contain content-control statements*. (Office Action ¶ 5).

The style sheet editor and style sheet that describes font usage and text layout for each control, as described in Ferrel, and an assertion that it “is known in the art that *style sheets typically contain content-control statements*” is not sufficient to show that Ferrel discloses a “content-control statement” or that Ferrel discloses in as complete in detail the “content-control statement,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. As noted above, Ferrel does not disclose that the style sheet is used in an editing process to bind an edit form or a control from the edit form to a piece of content or an item of the piece of content, so there is no reason for one skilled in the art to reasonably conclude to use style sheets containing content-control statements in the Ferrel system as the Examiner alleges. Absent any evidence that one skilled in the art would make such a connection (and hence modify the teachings of Ferrel – which means that Ferrel is not anticipatory), the rejection must fail. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1 and 16 cannot stand. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of independent claims 1 and 16 and the claims that depend therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Ferrel.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2747/303264.01
Application No.: 10/721,146
Office Action Dated: April 25, 2007

PATENT

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application including claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Date: August 27, 2007

/Michael P. Dunnam/
Michael P. Dunnam
Registration No. 32,611

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439